

Circ.: m. 534,376  
S. 1,149,467Front Edit Other  
Page Page Page

Date:

CPYRGHT

CPYRGHT

## U.S. Against Joining A U.N. Police Force

By JAMES RESTON

Special to The New York Times.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 4—

The United States Government is opposed to putting its troops into any United Nations police force that may be established to maintain peace in the Middle East.

According to responsible officials here, the Eisenhower Administration believes that a policy of United States participation in an international force in the Middle East inevitably would lead to a request by the Soviet Union to do the same.

The United States, it can be said, is unalterably opposed to any move that would invite Soviet soldiers into that area. In fact, it is the object of Washington's policy to see to

it that Communist influence is kept as far away from the Suez Canal as possible.

This does not mean that the United States Government favors the creation of such a force but is not willing to do anything to support it. Washington will offer to give it material support. Specifically, it will offer to make available to any United Nations force in the Middle East supplies and facilities, such as aircraft that will be needed to transport troops and matériel to the area.

A distinction is drawn here, however, between this kind of support and actually placing United States units on guard there, as was done in Korea.

Sherman Adams, assistant to the President, said on a television show he thought it "very doubtful" that the United States would contribute troops to the proposed international force.

In any event, he added, the United States contribution would be "minor" rather than "major." He suggested that the smaller free nations might be willing to take on the policing job. He did not, however, mention the real reason for the Administration's unwillingness to offer troops, namely, that by staying out ourselves the United States can avoid a policy of giving the Soviet Union a place on the force.

### White House Is Active

Washington was quiet on the surface today. It was warm and gray. Outwardly little seemed to be going on. But the White House was the scene of quiet activity on the Middle Eastern question both in the morning and afternoon.

Officials also were active at the State and Defense Departments and the Central Intelligence Agency, though Allen Dulles, head of that agency, took time out to visit, and bring back an encouraging report about, his brother, Secretary of State Dulles, who underwent a serious abdominal operation at Walter Reed Hospital yesterday.

Another reason put forward here for avoiding United States participation in a Suez Canal policing operation is that, despite Washington's opposition to the Israeli-British-French military activity in Egypt, the Arab states still are hostile to Washington because of its major role in setting up the state of Israel in the first place.

The United States Government, indeed, is finding that the Arab world's suspicion of United States friendship with Israel is now limiting its efforts to bring about a cease-fire and a general settlement of political, economic and commercial difficulties in that part of the world.

The United States, in its first resolution at the United Nations on the Middle Eastern crisis, concentrated on trying to end the present military hostilities. The Arab nations supported Washington on this.

In its second and third resolutions, however, the United States urged not only the ending of fighting but the negotiation of permanent settlements of the issues that had given rise to the Suez Canal and Arab-Israeli disputes.

The Arab nations were not so enthusiastic about this, feeling that Washington, while opposing the fighting, was trying to take advantage from the military situation to bring about a settlement more favorable to the Western powers and Israel.

While President Eisenhower sent a message to Premier Bulganin of the Soviet Union during the day urging an end to the slaughter and the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Hungary, he did not, so far as could be determined, communicate with either Guy Mollet, Premier of

The official public reaction to Britain and France is "quite moderate." A conscious effort is being made to emphasize that, while the United States differs with Britain and France on what they have done in Egypt, it is eager to prevent this disagreement from having any disruptive effect on the Atlantic alliance.

Mr. Adams made this point during his question-period. He said the British and the French had carefully avoided telling the United States anything about what he called the "debacle" in the Middle East, and conceded that they had not followed President Eisenhower's leadership in this case. But he insisted that this was temporary and that the best chance of preventing a large war in that part of the world was through the President's influence and policies.

To bring about peace in the world with justice, Mr. Adams said, is the policy of the Administration. The "white race" undoubtedly is going to "hang together" in world affairs, he said. At the same time, the United States wants to promote the freedom and independence of all states, regardless of whether they are large or small, white, black, or brown, he said.